

March 26, 1996

LB 828-830, 1368

cap on salaries of \$40,000 to \$50,000...

SENATOR LYNCH: Yeah, I understand that.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Not to exceed 5 percent.

SENATOR LYNCH: And actually the cap is 4.67 or .78 or something like that, 5.67 so I know that there could be people that'll pay more, but there (inaudible).

SENATOR BRASHEAR: And the employee won't factor into the 1368 formula.

SENATOR WILL: Time.

SENATOR LYNCH: I've got some more...I'll...I don't know how much time, how much more time I have, if...but I spoke on it twice.

SENATOR WILL: It's time, Senator. Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Members of the body, I rise in opposition to the Wickersham amendment. I want to make that clear at the onset and then I'll explain why. I have deliberately tried to stay out of the debate and the discussion on 1368, largely for personal reasons because, as you remember, last year when we passed LB 829, 828, and 830, we spent countless...well, I guess you could count the hours, I don't want to count the hours, lots and lots and lots of hours on the floor. Stayed till midnight several evenings in a row and, quite frankly, it was something I'm glad we did it. I think we made the right decision, think we have economic development tools in place, but it was something that took a fairly high degree, high personal toll on me. When I read in the paper this last fall that the Union Pacific individuals had taken a look at 829 and felt it may not have been workable for them, my reaction at that time was frustration, a little bit of anger, little bit of disbelief and not wanting to get...go through that whole operation again. I'm very happy Senator Brashear has volunteered to take on this duty this year. As I got more and more involved in it though, I finally came to the conclusion and understood why 829 may not work for Union Pacific and why what 1368 is doing is an option, not just for Union Pacific but for other companies that, (A) have the collective bargaining provisions of representation by a